

The University of Chicago

THE TRANSLATION OF ARAMAIC *Dî*
IN THE GREEK BIBLES

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1943

By

DAVID KEITH ANDREWS

Reprinted from
THE JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
Vol. 66, No. 1, March, 1947

The University of Chicago

THE TRANSLATION OF ARAMAIC *Dî*
IN THE GREEK BIBLES

A PART OF A DISSERTATION SUBMITTED TO THE
FACULTY OF THE DIVINITY SCHOOL IN CANDIDACY
FOR THE DEGREE OF DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

1943

By

DAVID KEITH ANDREWS

Reprinted from
THE JOURNAL OF BIBLICAL LITERATURE
Vol. 66, No. 1, March, 1947



THE TRANSLATION OF ARAMAIC *dî* IN THE GREEK BIBLES

D. K. ANDREWS

KNOX COLLEGE, TORONTO

THE language in which some of the Old Testament Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha (and parts of the New Testament) were originally composed has been the subject of considerable discussion in recent years. Resemblances to Aramaic or Hebrew style and supposed mistranslations in the Greek texts have been regarded as evidence of translation from Semitic prototypes by some scholars; similar style and syntactic constructions in *koiné* documents are cited as proofs of Greek authorship by others. Objective criteria by which translation Greek can be distinguished from that of original composition are manifestly needed. Greek versions of extant Semitic documents may provide means for determining both some principles by which translators were guided and the nature of their divergences from normal usage — means which have not yet been fully utilized.¹ Translations from biblical Aramaic afford an opportunity to discover if translations from Aramaic can be distinguished from documents composed originally in Greek.² The purpose of the present study is to discover how the Aramaic particle *dî* (which, that, of) was rendered in Greek.

¹ However, for studies of the translations of Dan 1 1—2 22; 8 1—26, see A. P. Wikgren, *A Comparative Study of the Theodotianic and Septuagint Translations of Daniel* (Ph.D. Dissertation, Divinity School, University of Chicago, 1932); and J. M. Rife, "The Mechanics of Translation Greek" *JBL* 52 [1933] 244–252).

² Aramaic-Greek parallels also exist in bilingual inscriptions at Palmyra and elsewhere, but many are bilingual expressions of the same thought, rather than translations, and the Aramaic in others may be a translation of the Greek.

This relative particle is particularly significant. The frequency of its occurrence allows adequate observation of its rendering — it occurs 347 times in 22 pages of Aramaic text in the third edition of Kittel's *Biblia Hebraica*.³ In addition, the diversity of its uses would leave its mark on Greek translations: it was used as a relative pronoun, as a genitive particle, as a simple conjunction, and as an element in compound conjunctions. Moreover, it was used in many idioms and grammatical constructions foreign to Greek syntax. In the treatment of this ubiquitous and versatile particle the marks of translation Greek should be evident.

The Aramaic texts to be considered consist of Jer 10 11; Ezra 4 7 — 6 18; 7 12–26; Dan 2 4 — 7 28. In both Ezra and Daniel we are fortunate in having two separate Greek versions made at different times, and also a number of variant readings which may represent the work of Aquila and Symmachus. One translation of Daniel, preserved in the Codex Chisianus and the Chester Beatty Papyri, has long been regarded as septuagintal; the other, which replaced it in the Christian Greek Bible, is recognized as Theodotionic. Both versions of Ezra found a place in the Greek Bible as I and II Esdras. The translation phenomena in I Esdras are similar to those in the LXX of Daniel, while II Esdras, though somewhat more literal, seems to belong to the same version as the Theodotionic Daniel.⁴ Accordingly, in this study, the terms "LXX" and "Theodotion" will refer to I and II Esdras, respectively, as well as to the two versions of Daniel.⁵

The translations must not be compared to classical Attic but to the contemporary *koiné*. This norm, however, is not to be based on ungrammatical papyri or singular examples of erroneous syntax. A man capable of translating a book from his sacred

³ Stuttgart: Privil. Württemb. Bibelanstalt, 1937.

⁴ Cf. C. C. Torrey, *Ezra Studies* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1910), pp. 62–114, and the editorial note by H. H. Schaefer in Kittel, *op. cit.*, p. 1284.

⁵ References will, as a rule, indicate the location of the passage in the printed Hebrew Bible. Where different the Greek reference will be added in parentheses. In the case of Ezra the parenthetical figures will refer only to I Esdras.

literature would not be ignorant of current Greek literary style. Accordingly, the translations will be measured against *koiné* common literary usage.

1. Translations of *dî* used as a relative pronoun

In Biblical Aramaic *dî* is a relative pronoun in 158 instances. These may be grouped according to the function of *dî* in the clause. The simplest type consists of *dî* and a prepositional phrase, for example: בית־אלהא די בירושלם, "the house of God which (is) in Jerusalem" (Ezra 4 24, etc.⁶). Marti called these "incomplete relative clauses of qualification,"⁷ but they are really attributive phrases. The presence of *dî* depends on the state of the antecedent rather than on the needs of the relative expression; *dî* does not appear after indefinite nouns, except in the redundant phrase: גברין גבר־חיל די בחילה, "men, army men, who (were) in his army" (Dan 3 20).⁸

Thus, the translators used an attributive phrase with the article as in τὰ θηρία τὰ ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ, "the beasts before it" (Th., Dan 7 7), fifty times (see Table 1).⁹ But in Greek the attributive phrase usually comes between the article and the noun, as in τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ θηρία (LXX, *ibid.*),¹⁰ but it has this position in the translations only three times, all in the LXX.¹¹ Each example appears natural by itself,¹² but, when all attribu-

⁶ Including Ezra 5 17, where some Hebrew MSS, supported by the LXX, read די instead of דך, and 6 3, where they insert it before בירושלם.

⁷ D. K. Marti, *Kurzgefasste Grammatik der biblisch-aramäischen Sprache* (Berlin: Reuther & Reichard, 1896), sect. 139.

⁸ E. g., אלה בשמיא, "a God in heaven," in Dan 2 28; cf. 2 25, Ezra 4 16, 7 13. In Ezra 7 23 the antecedent כל is to be considered definite.

⁹ In five cases B is defective and A *et al.* are followed; see footnotes to Table 1. Two additional examples are found in I Esdras where ἐκ τοῦ ναοῦ τοῦ ἐν Βαβυλωνίᾳ translates בבבל די הכלא די (5 14 [6 17]) and τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ θεοῦ σου τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ renders בירושלם די בית אלהך די (7 19 [8 17]), instead of the Masoretic Text.

¹⁰ Cf. H. W. Smyth, *A Greek Grammar for Colleges* (New York: The American Book Co., 1920), secs. 1157 f.

¹¹ Ezra 5 6 (6 7); 6 6 (6 26); Dan 7 7.

¹² But, in expressions such as οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ, (Th., Ezra 4 24), it would be slightly more natural for either the genitive or the

tive prepositional phrases follow the noun as in Theodotion, or when nineteen of twenty-two follow it as in the LXX, the result is foreign to Greek style.

Disregarding the five occurrences lacking parallels in the versions,¹³ there are only seven exceptions to this mode of translation. Theodotion's *ἄνδρας ἰσχυροὺς ἰσχύι*, "men strong in strength," for the irregular phrase in Dan 3 20, has no representation of *dî*.¹⁴ In Dan 5 13 (10) the LXX rendered the cumbersome phrase יהוה די מרביניגלותא די by a relative clause: *ὃς ἦν ἐκ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας τῆς Ἰουδαίας*, "who was from the captivity of Judah"; but the whole chapter is translated freely.¹⁵ The LXX paraphrased the Aramaic three times. Twice the Aramaic was either misread as a genitive phrase, or a text lacking the preposition ב was used; this is a typical mistranslation, but one difficult to detect from the Greek alone.

Thus the Greek article was considered the counterpart of *dî* in these phrases, and the position of the phrase is the only clear mark of Aramaic influence. Of the two, Theodotion's version is much closer to the Masoretic Text. It has the same word order in all cases, has no paraphrases,¹⁶ lacks an equivalent for *dî* only once, and omits only one phrase. But the LXX, though more free, also regularly follows the Aramaic word order and translates *dî* by the Greek article.

prepositional phrase to precede the noun. Cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 1164, and F. Bliss, *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*, revised by A. Debrunner (6th ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1931), sec. 269, 1.

¹³ Including I Esd 8 12, where the MT (7 14) has ברה אלהך די בדרך, "by the law of your God which (is) in your hand." A, N, *et al.* have ἀκολουθῶς ὡς ἔχει ἐν τῷ νομῷ τοῦ Κυρίου, "according as it is in the law of the Lord," with the attributive phrase omitted as in 7 25 (8 23). This is corrupted in B to ἀκολούθως ὥς ἔχει νόμῳ Κυρίου "according to the law of the Lord which he has."

¹⁴ The LXX translated this as a substantivized expression: *ἄνδρας ἰσχυροτάτους τῶν ἐν τῇ δυνάμει*, "men, strongest of those in the forces."

¹⁵ The LXX may have translated this chapter from an abstracted Aramaic text; cf. J. A. Montgomery, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Daniel* ("The International Critical Commentary" [New York: Scribner's, 1927]), p. 267.

¹⁶ But note the idiomatic rendition of בראיה די בראשהם, "the men at their head" (Ezra 5 10), by τῶν ἀνδρῶν τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτῶν, "the men ruling them."

Three times *dī* introduces an appositional phrase (see Table 1). In Dan 2 39 the LXX treated דִּי נְחֹשֶׁת, "namely, the bronze," as a genitive phrase; Theodotion has a relative clause: ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ χαλκός. In Ezra 6 8 (6 28) the LXX paraphrased מִנְכֶּסֶי מַלְכָּא דִּי מִדַּת עֵבֶר נְהִרָה, "from the possessions of the king, namely, the tribute of Across-the-River"; in Theodotion's ἀπὸ ὑπαρχόντων βασιλέως τῶν φόρων πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ the article τῶν may represent *dī*, but in a formal way without regard to its function in the sentence. The third example is found in neither version and may be a gloss.

The four nominal relative clauses with *dī* as subject differ only slightly from appositional phrases (see Table 1).¹⁷ In Dan 7 17 Theodotion has the attributive phrase τὰ τέσσερα for דִּי אַרְבַּע, "which are four." In Dan 2 30 both versions have the article and present participle of εἶμι for דִּי אֵימִי בִי, "which is in me." Theodotion has a relative clause in Ezra 4 9, where דְּהוּא should be emended to דִּי הוּא, and in 6 15, apparently confusing the pronouns הוּא, הֵיא, with the verb הָיָה. In 6 15 (7 5) the LXX treated דִּי הִיא שְׁנַת־שֵׁשׁ, "which is the sixth year," as a genitive phrase: τοῦ ἑκτοῦ ἔτους.

Relative clauses where *dī* is the subject of a verbal form may be classified on the basis of whether the Aramaic has a participle, a perfect, or an imperfect verb (see Table 2). In eleven clauses *dī* is the subject of a participle. The versions have an article and attributive participle fifteen times.¹⁸ A present participle is used, except twice where Theodotion has that of the perfect tense.¹⁹ Further, it always follows the noun modified, whereas, in original composition, it more often precedes. This deviation is the only apparent mark of translation.

There are only two variant translations. In Dan 5 5 the LXX rendered כְּתָבָה דִּי יְדָה פֶּס, "the wrist of the hand which was writing," by an indefinite expression without the article: χεῖρα γρά-

¹⁷ Clauses with participles or the copula הָיָה will be considered verbal clauses in this study.

¹⁸ Including Ezra 4 17 (2 21), where the LXX has τοῖς συντασσομένοις καὶ οἰκοῦσιν for כְּנוּתָהוּן דִּי יַחְבִּין, "their colleagues who dwell." The use of καὶ rendered a second article to represent *dī* otiose.

¹⁹ τῶ μὴ εἰδότε in Ezra 7 25 and ἡ ἐντεταγμένη in Dan 5 25.

φουσαν. In 5²³ Theodotion has οἱ οὐ βλέπουσιν for דִּי לֹא חוּין, "who do not see," perhaps using the relative clause for variety after the preceding attributive adjectives.

In two relative clauses *dī* is the subject of a periphrastic form composed of a participle and the copula הָיָה. In Ezra 5¹¹ (6¹³) בְּנָה, "which was built," is rendered freely in the LXX, but literally translated by ὅς ἦν οἰκοδομημένος in Theodotion. In Dan 7¹⁹ Theodotion treated *dī* as a conjunction and translated דִּי הוּא שְׁנִיָּה, "which was different," by ὅτι ἦν διαφέρον; the LXX has τοῦ διαφθείροντος, apparently a corruption of τοῦ διαφέροντος. These phenomena agree with the tendency of the LXX to disregard the copula, and of Theodotion to use a relative clause where it appears.

The article and attributive participle also appear thirteen times translating clauses where *dī* is the subject of a perfect verb.²⁰ But, in these cases, it is the aorist participle, except in LXX, Dan 4¹⁷, where it is perfect, and in Th., Dan 3²², where the present is used to indicate accompanying action. These participles also follow the noun modified.

The versions have a relative clause with ὅς six times. But in שְׁמָה, "who caused his name to dwell" (Ezra 6¹² [6³²]), *dī* is mistaken for a *casus pendens* before the suffix of שְׁמָה,²¹ and in Dan 2¹⁴ the LXX treated it incorrectly as indirect object. The remaining three clauses are few compared to the number of participles. In addition, Theodotion twice has the conjunction ὅτι, but its use may be justified by the explanatory nature of the clauses.

Where *dī* is the subject of an imperfect verb, however, the versions usually have a relative clause. The LXX has three paraphrastic renderings, but the only deviation in Theodotion is

²⁰ Including Ezra 4¹² (2¹⁷), where both versions have οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ἀναβάντες, "the Jews, having come up," for יְהוּדִיָּא דִּי סָלְקוּ. But the Aramaic demands an attributive, not a circumstantial, participle, and the article appears in the LXX in HP 71, 106, 120, 121, 134 (cf. also Eth., Syr., Jos., Old Lat., Vulg.), and in Th. in HP 19, 52, 64, 93, 108, 119, 243. Haplography would explain its loss.

²¹ Th. has οὗ κατασκευοῦ τὸ ὄνομα, "whose name dwells." In correcting this Lucian used an attributive participle (ὁ κατασκευώσας); see HP 19, 93, 108.

the omission of the relative once due to textual corruption,²² and twice for the sake of a simpler Greek text.²³ In Daniel *ὅς* or *ὅστις* is used without apparent difference in meaning.²⁴ The antecedents are indefinite, but in the *koiné* the indefinite relative was obsolescent, except for the use of *ἥτις* before vowels where *ἥ* would cause hiatus.²⁵ In the LXX only this form appears, and three of the four examples occur before vowels. In Theodotion *ἥτις* always precedes a vowel, while *ἥ* is used before consonants as in *ἥτις ἐστὶν ὁ χαλκός ἡ κυριεύσει* (Dan 2 39), but, whether by design or accident, the opposite is true of the forms *ὅς* and *ὅστις*, with one exception.²⁶

In Daniel these clauses have a future indicative verb, except for the LXX's two aorist subjunctives after the negative in 7 14. This variation is not significant since the *koiné* tended to equate these two forms of the verb.²⁷ The future indicative correctly indicates the purpose or intended result which most of these clauses express,²⁸ but it is apparently due to Aramaic influence twice, where the present tense would be more natural in reference to a present characteristic of the antecedent.²⁹

The only clause of this type in Ezra is *שאר חשחות בית אלהך די יפל לך למנות*, "the rest of the requirement of the house of your God which it may fall to you to give" (7 20 [8 17]). The LXX has *ὅσα ἂν ὑποπίπτῃ*;³⁰ Theodotion has *ὃ ἂν φανῇ σοι δοῦναι*.

²² In Dan 6 13 (12) most MSS read *καὶ τὸ δόγμα Μήδων καὶ Περσῶν οὐ παρελεύσεται*, "and the law of Medes and Persians shall not pass away"; *καί* replaced the original *κατά* found in HP 23, 148, and rendered a relative pronoun before *οὐ* otiose.

²³ In Dan 7 14 compare *ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ οὐ διαφθαρήσεται* with the LXX's *ἡ βασιλεία αὐτοῦ, ἥτις οὐ μὴ φθαρή*, "his kingdom is one which shall not perish."

²⁴ Compare 2 39 with 2 44 and 3 15 with 3 29 (96).

²⁵ Cf. L. Radermacher, *Neutestamentliche Grammatik: das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache* (2nd ed.; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck], 1925), p. 75.

²⁶ In Dan 6 28 (27); but *ὅτι* would be preferable here, for the clause explains the preceding statements and is far removed from a possible antecedent.

²⁷ Cf. Radermacher, *op. cit.*, p. 167 f.

²⁸ Cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, secs. 2554, 2558.

²⁹ 2 10; 3 29 (96).

³⁰ A has *ἐάν*; this occurs as a variant *koiné* spelling of *ἂν*.

The use of *ἄν* and the subjunctive, as in more vivid future conditions,³¹ reflects the conditional significance of the original.

In relative clauses where *dî* is the object of a verbal form (see Table 3), the Aramaic has a participle six times, all in Daniel. In each case the versions have a relative clause introduced by *ὅς* as in *ὁ λόγος ὃν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐπερωτᾷ* for *מלתא די מלכא שאל*, "the thing which the king is asking" (2 11). The verb is present indicative, except in 7 14, where Theodotion has an imperfect, and in 2 27, where the LXX has the perfect *ἐώρακεν*.

Dî occurs as the object of a periphrastic form only in the phrase *די הוה צבא*, "him whom he was wishing," repeated four times in Dan 5 19. The LXX has no translation, but Theodotion, treating it as a past conditional relative clause, has *οὗς ἐβούλετο*.

Where *dî* is the object of a verb in the perfect, the translators use the relative *ὅς* with an aorist indicative forty-five times, as in Theodotion's *ἐθνῶν ὧν ἀπέκτισεν* for *אמניא די הגלי* "the nations whom he carried captive" (Ezra 4 10). The relative was attracted into the genitive or dative case by its antecedent (as in the above example) even more frequently than in ordinary Greek. In Ezra 4 18 (2 22) the LXX has a perfect,³² and in 5 14 (6 17) it is paraphrastic. In Dan 2 23 it has *ὅσα ἠξίωσα* for the substantivized clause *די בעינא*, "that which we asked." In 2 24 it has an aorist passive participle — *τὸν κατασταθέντα* — for *די מני*, "whom he appointed," perhaps due to the similarity of the form *מני* to the *pe'il*. But these are the only variations from the regular mode of translation.³³

While translation by a relative clause is quite natural in these cases, it differs from the practice where *dî* is the subject of a verbal form. As a result, most attributive participles are active and usually in the present or aorist, but the relative pronoun with a present or aorist is most often the object of its verb.

Occasionally the Aramaic relative clause contains an anaphoric

³¹ Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 2565.

³² But N; HP 19, 108, 245 have *ἐπέμψατε* instead of *πεπόμφατε*.

³³ In Th., Ezra 5 14 *τῷ Βαγασάρ τῷ θησαυροφύλακι τῷ ἐπὶ τοῦ θησαυροῦ*, "to Bagasar the treasurer who was over the treasure," is not a variant, but a result of confusing *שמה* and *שחבז* in *שמה די פחה שמה*, "Sheshbazzar his

suffix as in יהון מניח יתהון, "as for whom, you appointed them" (Dan 3 12), i. e. "whom you appointed." In a literal rendering, such as οὗς κατέστησας αὐτούς, the pronoun is redundant. Readings of this type, apparently from Aquila's translation, are found six times in a few Theodotionic manuscripts of Daniel (see Table 4).³⁴ Good Greek requires that either the particle *dī* or the suffix be disregarded.

The LXX omits such verbal suffixes, except in Ezra 5 14 (6 17) where the suffix is in a co-ordinated clause rather than immediately after the relative. The translation — ἀ ἐξήνεγκεν . . . καὶ ἀπηρεύσας αὐτά, "which he carried off . . . and brought them,"— with αὐτός in the second clause is a natural Greek idiom.³⁵ It omits the nominal suffix in Dan 2 11,³⁶ but elsewhere keeps it and uses καί instead of a relative pronoun. It translates both *dī* and the suffix only in Ezra 6 12 (6 32), where די שכן שמה, "who caused his name to dwell there," is wrongly rendered by οὗ τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ ἐπικέκληται ἐκεῖ.

Theodotion translated *dī* by the relative ὅς in these clauses, except in Dan 5 12, where he has καί instead, and twice where he misunderstood the Aramaic.³⁷ He also represented the suffix five times, but twice it is in a co-ordinated clause,³⁸ and in ὅς πνεῦμα θεοῦ ἅγιον ἐν ἐαυτῷ ἔχει, "who has a holy spirit of God in himself" (Dan 4 5), it is justified by the addition of ἔχει. The pronoun is redundant only in οὗ ἡ πνοή σου ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ, "in whose hand is your breath" (Dan 5 23), and in ὧν ἦν

name, whom he made governor," with forms such as שימח, שימח, "treasure," in Jewish-Palestinian Aramaic.

³⁴ Cf. J. A. Montgomery, "The Hexaplaric Strata in the Greek Texts of Daniel" (*JBL* 44 [1925] 296 f.), and C. D. Benjamin, "Collation of Holmes-Parsons 23 (Venetus)—62—147 in Daniel from Photostatic Copies" (*ibid.*, pp. 303—326).

³⁵ Cf. Blass-Debrunner, *op. cit.*, sect. 297.

³⁶ Cf. also οὗ ἡ ὄρασις μεγάλη, "of which the appearance was great" (Dan 4 17). This is a free translation of a clause co-ordinated with the simpler clause immediately after *dī*.

³⁷ In 7 15 he has τῷ ἐν Ἱερουσαλὴμ κατασκηνοῦντι, "the one dwelling in Jerusalem," for די בירושלם משכנו, "as for whom, his dwelling is in Jerusalem." For 5 14, see n. 34.

³⁸ Ezra 4 10; 5 14.

Δανιήλ εἷς ἐξ αὐτῶν, "one of whom was Daniel" (Dan 6 3 [2]).³⁹ The latter, however, has a *koiné* parallel, as follows: ἐξ ὧν δώσεις . . . ἐν ἐξ αὐτῶν, "one of which you shall give."⁴⁰ Thus redundant pronouns due to anaphoric suffixes rarely occur except in literal translations. The use of καί with an anaphoric pronoun in place of a relative clause is a less obvious but more frequent mark of translation.

Since relative clauses which have an antecedent כל with indefinite significance are usually rendered by ὅς with αὖν and the aorist subjunctive, they may be treated as a special group. This pattern of translation appears in both versions throughout Daniel and three times in Ezra (see Table 5); for example, Theodotion has πᾶς ἄνθρωπος ὅς αὖν αἰτήσῃ for כל אַנשׁ דִּי־יִבְעָה, "any man shall ask," in Dan 6 13 (12).⁴¹ In Ezra the LXX three times has ὅσος instead of ὅς, and Theodotion once has ὅστις. The use of ὅσοι, ὅσα instead of πᾶς ὅς, πᾶν ὅ is a mark of free translation. After πᾶς, ὅστις is most common in Greek composition, but it is frequently replaced by ὅς before αὖν,⁴² and in the *koiné* it was falling into disuse.

The factor which influenced translation most was not the antecedent כל but the conditional significance of these clauses. Since all but one refer to the future, the use of αὖν with the subjunctive is appropriate in Greek. In Ezra 7 23, Theodotion correctly uses the present indicative in a present condition. But three times in Ezra the verb with ὅς is future indicative;⁴³ this may represent Aramaic influence, since this tense was rarely used in this type of clause.⁴⁴ Lucian, with his Atticizing tendencies, corrected all these indicatives to subjunctives with αὖν.⁴⁵

Sometimes δι is associated with מן or מִה, forming a compound relative of indefinite significance as in מִן־דִּי־לֹא יִפֹּל, "whoever does not fall down" (Dan 3 6). Where clauses introduced by this

³⁹ So A; ὅς, as in B, is an error, for it has no antecedent.

⁴⁰ Papyrus Oxyrhynchus I, 117, 1. 15.

⁴¹ In Ezra 7 21 (8 19) both versions have the present subjunctive.

⁴² Cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 2508.

⁴³ LXX, Ezra 6 12 (6 32); Th., Ezra 6 11, 12.

⁴⁴ Cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 2565, a.

⁴⁵ See HP 19, 93, 108.

compound are conditional, the versions have *ἄν* and the subjunctive (see Table 5). In these cases Theodotion has the relative *ὅς*, except in Ezra 7 18 where the Greek is corrupt,⁴⁶ while the LXX has *ὅς* three times and *ὅσος* twice. Twice the LXX inserted *πᾶς* before the relative,⁴⁷ but otherwise the presence of *מן*, *מה* left no mark on the translations.

The clause *מה די להווא*, "what shall be," found four times in Dan 2, refers to events already determined by God. In verse 45 the LXX has *τὰ ἐσόμενα*, the only future participle used in translating a relative clause. In verse 29a Theodotion, treating it as an indirect question, has *τί δεῖ γενέσθαι*, "(your thoughts upon your bed have gone up) what is to happen";⁴⁸ while this fits the context, it reflects the influence of *מה*. Otherwise both versions have *ἃ δεῖ γενέσθαι*.

In Ezra 6 8 (6 27) both versions mistranslate *למא די חעברון*, "as to what you shall do." The LXX has *ἵνα συμποιῶσιν*, "that they may work together," treating *דִּי* as a final particle. Theodotion has *μή ποτέ τι ποιήσῃτε*, "lest you should do anything," apparently confusing *די למא* with *למה* *די*.

Occasionally *דִּי* is a relative of place or time (see Table 5). In Dan 2 38 the LXX translated *בכל די דארין*, "everywhere they dwell," by *ἐν πάσῃ τῇ οἰκουμένῃ*, but Theodotion has more correctly *ἐν παντὶ τόπῳ ὅπου κατοικοῦσιν*. In Ezra 6 3 (6 23) Theodotion renders *די אחר* by *τόπος οὗ*,⁴⁹ while the LXX has *ὅπου*. In 6 1 (6 22) *דִּי* is a *casus pendens* before the adverb *חמה* in *די נמיא מהחתינ חמה*, "where the treasures are laid up." The LXX has a free translation, and Theodotion has *ὅπου* with no parallel for the adverb. The Lucianic manuscripts include the adverb as follows: *οὗ αἱ γὰρ αἰ ἐκείντο ἐκεῖ*.⁵⁰

⁴⁶ A, N, *et al.* have *εἴ τι . . . ἀγαθύνθῃ*, "if anything should be good," for *מה די . . . יטב*, "whatever may be good." Perhaps this was considered an indirect question. "Ετι, in B, is wrong. G. Jahn suggests an original *ὅ τι* (*Die Bücher Esra [A und B] und Nehemja* [Leiden: Brill, 1909], p. 62).

⁴⁷ Ezra 7 18 (8 16); Dan 3 6.

⁴⁸ Compare his translation of *להשניי* by *δεῖ παραλλάξαι* in 6 16 (15); whether he considered *להווא* an infinitive or not, he regarded it as deliberative.

⁴⁹ So A, N, *et al.*; B and HP 55 have *τόπου οὗ*.

⁵⁰ See HP 19, 93, 108.

In Dan 3 5 Theodotion renders בעדנא די תשמעון, "in the time when you shall hear," by ἡ ἂν ὥρα ἀκούσητε with the antecedent incorporated into the relative clause; in 3 15 he has ὥς ἂν. The LXX has, respectively, ὅταν and ἅμα τῷ with an infinitive.

A summary of these translations of *dî* as a relative pronoun is revealing. In clauses referring to past or present time a marked preference for the Greek article is noted where *dî* is subject, but, where it is object, the relative ὅς is preferred. In clauses with a future reference, however, a relative pronoun is used in both cases. Ὅς and ὅστις appear a number of times with the future indicative, usually in clauses of a final or consecutive nature with an indefinite antecedent. Ὅς, ὅσος, and ὅστις with ἂν and the subjunctive occur in conditional relative clauses. Three times a relative of place is used. Occasionally the Greek has no word to represent *dî* or used καί instead of a relative.

The requirements of Greek syntax are usually met, and the number of mistranslations is relatively small. An anaphoric suffix was retained three times in the form of a redundant pronoun.⁵¹ In two attributive phrases and in one nominal relative clause *dî* was mistaken for a genitive particle.⁵² In Ezra 6 8 (6 27) both versions mistranslate די למא. Theodotion used ὅτι instead of a relative three times,⁵³ and omitted the relative twice where the relative clause forms the predicate of a nominal sentence.⁵⁴ Some of these, such as the last,⁵⁵ are not recognizable apart from a knowledge of the original text. Others which result in "poor" Greek syntax (e. g., redundant pronoun) must be tested against the usage of later Greek; while not properly considered mistranslations if parallels occur in other documents, their presence in a text where the syntax is otherwise good would be a mark of Aramaic influence.

A tendency toward standardized translation is evident; the nearest Greek equivalent is used practically every time the same type of clause appears and the original word order is usually

⁵¹ LXX, Ezra 6 12 (6 32); Th., Dan 5 23; 6 8 (2).

⁵² LXX, Ezra 6 15 (7 5); 7 21 (8 19); Th., Ezra 5 17.

⁵³ Dan 3 28 (95); 4 19; 7 19.

⁵⁴ Dan 6 27 (26); 7 14.

⁵⁵ See n. 23.

retained. As a result, while each example seems natural by itself, certain types of phrases and clauses occur almost to the exclusion of others, and the great variety of expression usually found in Greek authors is lacking. Thus, attributive phrases and participles almost always follow the noun. Most attributive participles are active and either present or aorist. The relative *ὅς* is often object of a present or aorist indicative verb, but rarely subject. This is the most consistent type of Aramaic influence seen in these translations.

2. *Translations of *dî* used as a genitive particle*

Aramaic uses the relative particle in genitive phrases as an alternative to the construct state, without any difference in the meaning.⁵⁶ It is best to begin with indefinite phrases where, in the absence of the article, any representation of *dî* should be easily recognized (see Table 6). There is no parallel for *dî* in four such cases, but *ὥσεί* appears in three. Thus, the LXX has *πτερὰ ὥσεί ἀετοῦ*, "wings as of an eagle," for *גפין די נשר*, "eagle wings," in Dan 7 4; this is a free translation rather than an exact equivalent and is not used in the parallel expressions in 7 6. Similarly the LXX translated the definite phrase *בספר דכרניא די אבהתך*, "in the memoranda book of your fathers," by *ἐν τοῖς ἀπὸ τῶν πατέρων σου βιβλίοις* in Ezra 4 15 (2 18); but *ἀπὸ* can hardly be said to be a translation of *dî*.

With definite nouns, apart from paraphrastic and idiomatic renditions, there are four instances where *dî* is clearly not represented in the Greek. Three of these occur before proper names,⁵⁷ and one in Dan 5 24, where Theodotion has *ἀστράγαλος χειρός* for *פסא די ידא*.

Five times the versions have an attributive expression with the article. In Dan 4 12, 20 Theodotion has *τῇ χλοῇ τῇ ἔξω*, "the grass outside," for *דתאא די ברא*, "the grass of the field,"

⁵⁶ Compare, e. g., *גבא די אריותא* in Dan 6 17, 20 with *γὼν ἀρיותα* in 6 8, 13, 25. Both are translated by *ὁ λακκος τῶν λέοντων*. See also H. Bauer and P. Leander, *Grammatik des Biblisch-Aramäischen* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1927), sec. 90, d.

⁵⁷ LXX and Th., Dan 3 29 (96); Th., Dan 6 27 (26).

confusing ברא with the preposition בר. Twice an attributive adjective is used instead of a genitive.⁵⁸ In Ezra 5 14 (6 17) the LXX evidently read די בבבל. In none of these cases is the article a representation of a genitive particle.

In fifty-eight genitive phrases the article appears where *dî* stands in the Aramaic text. Ten times it occurs with proper names, but its use is due to Greek syntax. In Daniel די יהור is rendered by τῆς Ἰουδαίας five times;⁵⁹ geographical names of adjectival form require the article, a noun such as χώρα being understood.⁶⁰ Five times it is a case indicator before indeclinable names;⁶¹ it is used in this way very often in the LXX and always in Theodotion, unless the name is in the same case as the preceding noun as in τοῦ θεοῦ Σεδράχ, "of the God of Shadrach" (Dan 3 29 [96]).

The article is found five times where the noun following *dî* is determined by a suffix, and twenty-seven times where it is in the emphatic state. To these may be added two examples of τοῦ βασιλέως in II Esd 5 14.⁶² But the article is used in such cases whether *dî* is present or not;⁶³ it belongs to the following noun and is not a representation of *dî*.

The article appears twelve times where *dî* stands before a construct followed by a determined noun. But construct nouns have the article even when *dî* does not precede,⁶⁴ except in II Esd 7.⁶⁵ Thus, in II Esd 7 12, where ספר דתא די אלה שמיה, "the scribe of the law of the God of heaven," is rendered by γραμματεῖ νόμου τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, and in 7 17, 21 the article may represent *dî*; but this chapter is poorly translated.⁶⁶

⁵⁸ LXX, Ezra 7 26 (8 24); Th., Dan 2 41.

⁵⁹ Th., 2 25; 5 13; 6 14 (13); LXX, 2 25; 5 10.

⁶⁰ Cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 1139.

⁶¹ Th., Ezra 4 10, 23; LXX and Th., Dan 3 28 (95); LXX, Dan 6 27 (26). Cf. Blass-Debrunner, *op. cit.*, sec. 260, 2.

⁶² The MT has די בבבל, but αὐτοῦ in the LXX may indicate an original די מלכא; but cf. Bewer, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 f.

⁶³ See n. 56.

⁶⁴ See, e. g., II Esd 5 2, 4, 5, 12, 13.

⁶⁵ See, e. g., vss. 13, 16, 18, 19.

⁶⁶ The translator seems more familiar with Hebrew than with Aramaic. In vs. 24 he translated מנרה בלו והלך, "tribute, tax, and toll," by φόρος μὴ ἐστῶσι, "tribute is not to be (levied) on you," apparently reading מנרה בל

Thus, only in three instances, in a poorly translated chapter, is the genitive particle represented by the article. If the article were used as in the case of attributive phrases, a good Greek idiom would result with the article repeated and the genitive phrase following the noun (e. g., τὰ σκεύη τὰ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ θεοῦ). The absence of this idiom shows that the translators distinguished between the two uses of *dî* and felt no need to represent the genitive particle. The use of ἀπό and ὡσεῖ are free attempts to catch the meaning and not exact translations of *dî*.

The anticipatory suffixes found in a number of genitive phrases left no mark on the LXX or Theodotion. Three variant readings, however, indicate that Aquila retained them, translating, for example, בְּיוֹמֵיהֶן דִּי מַלְכֵי אֲנֹן, "in the days of those kings," by ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις αὐτῶν τῶν βασιλέων ἐκείνων.⁶⁷

The only example of the possessive pronoun in דִּי-יֵלֶּה in Dan 2 20; both versions have αὐτοῦ, the particle *dî* leaving no mark on the translation.

In genitive phrases indicating substance *dî* likewise made little impression on the translations (see Table 7). The noun of substance is usually translated by an adjective, though a genitive is used three times in the predicate.⁶⁸ In thirty-four cases, where the phrase is considered indefinite or is predicate, there is clearly no representation of *dî*.⁶⁹ An article appears with the adjective only when the noun is definite and, in each instance, it represents the emphatic state of the Aramaic noun; phrases without *dî* are translated in the same way.⁷⁰ In Dan 2 32a the LXX has ἀπό

לִּךְ (יהוה?) and treating בל as a Hebrew negative. In vs. 15 εἰς οἶκον Κυρίου indicates confusion of להיכלא with להיכלא; his failure to recognize the Aramaic infinitive might be due to greater familiarity with Hebrew where the *hiph'îl* infinitive of יבֵּל is הוֹבִיל. He did not always recognize the Aramaic article, but regularly translated שְׁמִיא אֱלֹהֵהּ by θεός τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, perhaps dividing it as follows: אֱלֹהֵהּ שְׁמִיא, and considering ה as the article. This makes it more likely that the article was meant to represent *dî* in these three verses.

⁶⁷ So read HP 62, 147 in Dan 2 44; cf. 3 28 (95); 4 23.

⁶⁸ LXX, Dan 2 32a, 33c; Th., Dan 2 32a.

⁶⁹ In Dan 2 39; 5 7, 16, 29 the LXX translates the definite phrases as though indefinite.

⁷⁰ Cf. τὰ σκευή τὰ χρυσᾶ as a translation of מֵאֵי דְהַבָּא (Dan 5 2), and of מֵאֵי דִּי דְהַבָּא (Ezra 5 14).

χρυσίου for דִּי דְהַב, but this, at most, is an attempt to reproduce the genitive particle in Greek.

Word order is the only definite mark of Aramaic influence. In Greek the majority of attributive adjectives and many genitives precede the noun. In the versions, however, they almost invariably follow it.

3. *Translations of dî used as a simple conjunction*

In Biblical Aramaic *dî* is a simple conjunction in seventy-one instances. Twenty-seven times it introduces a noun clause used as the object of a verb, including four examples of direct discourse. Although *ὅτι* frequently introduces direct discourse in Greek, it is used only once in the LXX and Theodotion⁷² (see Table 8), and omitted in the other cases. It is also omitted in both versions of the elliptical expression מִן־קֶשֶׁט דִּי אֱלֹהֵכֹן הוּא אֱלֹהֵינִי, "of a truth (I know) that your God is God of gods" (Dan 2 47). On the other hand, Aquila usually has *ὅτι*.⁷³

In the remaining object clauses, *dî* is usually represented by *ὅτι*; the LXX has it eight times, and Theodotion seventeen times. An accusative and infinitive is used only twice, once after *ὁράω*,⁷⁴ and once after *γινώσκω*.⁷⁴ But a clause with *ὅτι* follows *γινώσκω* thirteen times, although this verb more often takes a supplementary participle or an accusative and infinitive. A clause is also used after *ἐπίσκαω*,⁷⁵ which even in late Greek, usually has a supplementary participle.⁷⁶ The large proportion of clauses is due to the fact that the original has a clause introduced by *dî* in each case.

The conjunctions *ἵνα* and *ὅπως* each appear twice with the subjunctive in typical Greek object clauses such as *ἐγγνωρίσαμεν . . . ἵνα ἐπισκέψηται* for דִּי יִבְקֶר . . . הוֹדַעְנָא, "we made known . . . that search should be made" (Th., Ezra 4 14 f.). The LXX

⁷² LXX, Dan 2 25.

⁷³ See HP 62, 147 in Dan 2 25, 47; 6 6, 14 (5, 13).

⁷⁴ LXX, Dan 2 45.

⁷⁵ LXX, Dan 4 14.

⁷⁶ LXX and Th., Ezra 4 19 (2 22).

⁷⁷ Cf. Radermacher, *op. cit.*, p. 209.

also used ὅπως in Ezra 7 24 (8 22), mistaking δι for a final conjunction and translating מנהג בלו וזלך לא שליט למרמא . . . מוודעין די עליהם, "they make known that . . . tribute, tax, or custom no one has power to impose on them," as follows: λέγεται ὅπως . . . μηδεμία φορολογία . . . γίνηται, μηδένα ἔχειν ἐξουσίαν ἐπιβαλεῖν τούτοις, "it is said, in order that . . . there should be no tribute, no one has power to tax these men." Theodotion has no parallel for this δι, evidently regarding this as a direct quotation.⁷⁷

In Dan 5 29 Theodotion has ἐκήρυξεν περὶ αὐτοῦ τοῦ εἶναι αὐτὸν ἄρχοντα for שְׁלֵטַן יִהְיֶה דִּי־לְהוּא, "they proclaimed concerning him that he should be ruler."⁷⁸ The use of the article in this case may be due to the similarity of לְהוּא to an infinitive with ל.

In subject noun clauses δι is represented by ὅτι, except in Ezra 5 17 (6 21) where the LXX rightly used a supplementary participle after εὐρίσκω (see Table 8).

In appositional noun clauses both versions agree only in Dan 2 9, where they failed to see that the clause stood in apposition to the preceding verse and did not translate δι. In Dan 6 8 (7) the LXX has ὀρισμὸν . . . ὅτι πᾶς ἄνθρωπος . . . ριφῆται, "a decree . . . : Every man . . . shall be cast"; here ὅτι introduces a direct quotation. In 6 13 (12) the same clause is rendered freely with ἵνα and the aorist subjunctive. The LXX also used ἵνα after προστάσσω twice with the subjunctive⁷⁹ and once with the infinitive,⁸⁰ and after κρίνω once with the future indicative.⁸¹ Once it has the accusative and infinitive after προστάσσω.⁸² In these clauses ἵνα seems to be equivalent to ὅτι, though it is used only where the Aramaic verb is imperfect and the concept of purpose or intention is present.

Theodotion used ὅτι in three appositional clauses in Ezra. He

⁷⁷ An extraneous ἐν may indicate confusion of די with ב. The Lucianic MSS (HP 19, 93, 108) have τοῦ.

⁷⁸ See Table 8, n. b; cf. also Th., Dan 6 16, 27 (15, 26).

⁷⁹ Dan 3 10; Ezra 7 21 (8 19).

⁸⁰ Ezra 6 11 (6 31); the infinitive is used for the third person imperative in legal documents (cf. Smyth, *op. cit.*, sec. 2013, b).

⁸¹ Dan 3 29 (96).

⁸² Ezra 7 13 (8 10).

has no parallel for *dî* in Dan 3 29 (96), where he regarded the clause as a direct quotation, nor in 3 10, where the accusative *πάντα ἄνθρωπον* is followed by the future indicative.⁸³ Twice he has a Greek object clause with *ὅπως* and the future indicative, and twice the genitive of the article with an infinitive, where the Aramaic clause has an infinitive⁸⁴ or a form resembling an infinitive.⁸⁵ Thus, while *ὅτι* is used regularly when the Aramaic verb is perfect, there is less certainty about the representation of *dî* when it is imperfect and a greater preference for *ἵνα* or *ὅπως*.

Dî introduces a circumstantial clause standing in apposition to a sentence four times in Biblical Aramaic. The loosely attached clauses introduced by *ὥς* twice in the LXX and by *ὅτι* all four times in Theodotion are natural Greek counterparts (see Table 9).

In twelve clauses *dî* is a causal conjunction, a use closely related to the relative pronoun and resulting in some uncertainty as to its translation (see Table 9). Translation by a Greek relative clause, which may have causal significance, is not always wrong; thus, Theodotion's *ὅς ἀπέστειλεν* is a good rendering of the explanatory clause in *דִּי שְׁלַח . . . בְּרִיךְ אֱלֹהֵינוּ*, "blessed be their God . . . for he sent" (Dan 3 28 [95]), but the use of a clause instead of an attributive participle should be noted. The LXX has a relative clause once and Theodotion three times.⁸⁶

Otherwise Theodotion translated *dî* by *ὅτι* in causal clauses,⁸⁷ and the LXX used it three times. The LXX has *γάρ* once and in Dan 2 23b it has an articular infinitive with consecutive force, translating *דִּי מַלְכָּא הוֹדַעְתָּנָא*, "for the king's affair you have shown us," as follows: *ἐσήμανάς μοι ὅσα ἠξίωσα, τοῦ δηλῶσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ*, "you have shown me what I asked, so as to make known to the king."

When used as a final conjunction *dî* is never mistaken for a relative pronoun, even when some confusion might seem possible

⁸³ Perhaps an accusative and infinitive were originally intended.

⁸⁴ Dan 6 16 (15); the Greek has *τοῦ . . . οὐ δεῖ παραλλάξαι*, "that . . . it must not be changed." For the use of *δεῖ*, cf. n. 48.

⁸⁵ The form in Dan 6 27 (26).

⁸⁶ See n. 26.

⁸⁷ In Dan 2 23b *καί* actually appears, but, since *ὅτι* introduces the preceding clause it may be cited as the equivalent of *dî* here also.

(see Table 9). It is translated by *ὅπως* or *ἵνα* with the aorist subjunctive five times in the LXX and nine times in Theodotion. The LXX twice has an infinitive in Dan 3 15, where *ἐτοίμως* requires it, and in Ezra 5 10 (6 8), where *להודיעותך די נכתב*, "to make known to you, that we should write," is rendered by *ἐνεκεν τοῦ γνῶρίσαι καὶ γράψαι* (LXX) due to the influence of the preceding infinitive. Theodotion has *γνῶρίσαι σοι, ὥστε γράψαι* in the latter verse, treating the second clause as consecutive. He has an articular infinitive in Ezra 6 8, where an infinitive follows *dī*, and in Dan 6 2, 3 (1, 2), where he may have confused *לחן* with the infinitive of *נָתַן*.⁸⁸

Thus, *ὅτι* is the most frequent translation of *dī* when used as a simple conjunction, occurring sixteen times in the LXX and forty-one times in Theodotion.⁸⁹ The corresponding figures for *ὅπως* are six and seven; for *ἵνα*, seven and five. *Ὅτι* appears when the verb following *dī* is perfect or when the clause is nominal; when the verb is imperfect, *ὅτι* is used in translating statements, but expressions of intention or object have either *ἵνα* or *ὅπως*, usually with the subjunctive but sometimes with the present indicative. In cases of direct discourse *dī* is usually omitted in translation. Theodotion used the article when he considered the verbal form an infinitive.

The syntax of these clauses usually conforms to Greek standards for the period, and there are few mistranslations. Theodotion used the article and infinitive wrongly in translating three noun clauses; *τοῦ* also appears once in manuscripts of Aquila,⁹⁰ and twice in Lucianic manuscripts.⁹¹ Theodotion also used a relative pronoun instead of a causal conjunction in Dan 6 28 (27).⁹²

In a few instances the LXX has an idiomatic rendering, but the infrequency of idioms such as the supplementary participle, the accusative and infinitive, and causal and final participles is the best mark of translation.

⁸⁸ Cf. Dan 5 29, 6 27 (26).

⁸⁹ Including three instances where *dī* is classified as a relative pronoun, viz., Dan 3 28 (95); 4 19; 7 19.

⁹⁰ See HP 62, 147.

⁹¹ II Esd 7 21 (HP 93); 7 24 (HP 19, 93, 108).

⁹² See n. 26.

4. Translations of *dî* used in compound conjunctions

Forty times in Biblical Aramaic *dî* appears as an element in a compound conjunction (see Table 10): כְּדִי, probably the first of these to develop, occurs four times in Daniel as a temporal conjunction. Its long-established use and the fact that כ is an inseparable preposition discouraged analysis into its component parts. In 3 7 the LXX has ὅτε ἤκουσαν for כְּדִי שְׁמַעִין, "when they hear," but in 6 11 (10) its use of the aorist participle is idiomatic. Theodotion used the Greek conjunction that suited the context in each case. In 3 7 his ὅταν ἤκουον is an improvement on the LXX.⁹³ The semi-causal force of כְּדִי רַם לִבָּהּ, "when his heart was exalted" (5 20), is represented in ὅτε ὑψώθη ἡ καρδία αὐτοῦ. In 6 11 (10) ἡνίκα ἔγνων, "at the moment when he knew," gives a vivid picture of the promptness of the action that followed. In 6 15 (10) ὥς τὸ ρῆμα ἤκουσεν, "as soon as he heard the thing," illustrates the spontaneity of the king's grief. It is significant that, in spite of the relationship between כ and ὥς, this conjunction is used only once.

The comparative conjunction הַאֲרִידִי (wrongly read as הַאֲכִידִי in the MT) is found only in Dan 2 43. The LXX has the comparative conjunction ὥσπερ, while Theodotion used καθὼς which was popular in the *koiné* and a natural counterpart of הַאֲרִידִי.

מְדִידִי appears four times as a temporal and causal conjunction. In Ezra 4 23 (2 25), where it is temporal, the LXX has a genitive absolute, but in 5 12 (6 14) it has ἐπέι and in Dan 3 22 ἐπειδή, representing the causal force of מְדִידִי, "after, since." In Dan 3 22 Theodotion has ἐπέι. But in Ezra 5 12 he used ἀφ' ὅτε, and in Dan 4 23, where the verb is future and the clause temporal, he used ἀφ' ἧς with ἄν and the aorist subjunctive; the preposition represents מִן, while the relative translates *dî*.

עַדִּי, found as a temporal conjunction twelve times in Daniel, refers to time subsequent to the main verb. Except for the use of καί once in the LXX, the versions have ἕως, usually with a relative and with the aorist indicative or subjunctive depending

⁹³ The particle ἄν emphasizes the iterative character of the imperfect; cf. J. H. Moulton, *A Grammar of New Testament Greek, I, Prolegomena* (3rd ed.; Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1908), 167 f.

on whether the Aramaic verb is perfect or imperfect. The LXX has *ἕως ὅτου* with the indicative three times,⁹⁴ *ἕως τοῦ* with the infinitive once, and *ἕως* with *ἄν* and the subjunctive once. It might be noted that Codex Chisianus has four different translations of the conjunction in translating the same expression in Dan 7 4, 9, 11, 22; this may be due to a desire for variety.⁹⁵ Theodotion has *ἕως* in 7 11 and *ἕως ὅτου* in 7 9,⁹⁶ but elsewhere he has *ἕως οὗ*. The preposition *ἕως* is the factor which influenced these translations most. The representation of *dî* depended on the type of relative associated with *ἕως* in late Greek and might even be omitted.

The comparative *דִּי לְקַבֵּל* occurs only in the clause *דִּי לְקַבֵּל חָלַשׁ*, "according as he sent" (Ezra 6 13 7 1). Theodotion translated this as a preposition with a substantivized relative clause, as follows: *πρὸς ὃ ἀπέστειλεν*, "in conformity with what he sent." The LXX has *κατακολουθήσαντες τοῖς . . . προσταγείσιν*, reflecting the same conception of the clause.

The conjunction *דִּי כַלְקַבֵּל* (wrongly read as *דִּי כַל־קַבֵּל* in the MT)⁹⁷ is used fifteen times in Biblical Aramaic. It is used as a concessive conjunction in Dan 5 22, but neither version has an accurate translation. As a comparative conjunction the LXX renders it by *καθάπερ* in Dan 2 41, 45, but in 2 40 it has *ὥσπερ*, though the text is uncertain and this may represent *כ* in the following phrase. In all three cases Theodotion used *ὃν τρόπον*, "in which fashion"; though a correct representation of the conjunction, it is not literal. In 6 11 (10) both versions have *καθώς*.

The comparative significance of *דִּי כַלְקַבֵּל*, always more or less present, affected its translation in causal clauses. Thus, the LXX has *καθάπερ* three times; at least one of these — *καιρὸν ὑμεῖς ἐξαγοράζετε καθάπερ ἑωράκατε*, "you are buying time, according as you have seen" (Dan 2 8) — borders on mistranslation, for this clause is primarily causal. Twice the form of the conjunction led the LXX to use *καθότι*. Only in the use of

⁹⁴ In 7 9 the Chester Beatty Papyrus has *ἕως ὅτου*, but HP 87 has *ἕως ὅτε*.

⁹⁵ Note also that each example of *dî* as a simple conjunction in Daniel, chapters 6 f. is rendered differently.

⁹⁶ But HP 106, 147, 230, 232, 233 have *ἕως οὗ*.

⁹⁷ Cf. Bauer and Leander, *op. cit.*, sec. 69, q'.

διότι, ἐπεὶ, and καὶ once each did the LXX escape this influence. Theodotion, however, shows it only in the use of καθότι three times, having ὅτι in the remaining five instances. But in Dan 4 15 and 6 4 (3) Aquila used κατέναντι ὅτι, a literalistic interpretation of the Aramaic form without regard for Greek syntax.⁹⁸

The final conjunction דִּי דְּבַרָּהּ עַל occurs twice in Daniel. In 2 30 the preposition led both versions to represent it by ἕνεκεν τοῦ; a second dependent clause is co-ordinated with the one immediately after the conjunction, but a change in subject forced Theodotion to change his construction and use ἵνα as follows: ἕνεκεν τοῦ τὴν σύγκρισιν γνωρίσαι τῷ βασιλεῖ, ἵνα τοὺς διαλογισμοὺς τῆς καρδίας σου γνῶς, "in order to make the interpretation known to the king, that you should know the thoughts of your heart." In 4 14 Theodotion has ἵνα, while the LXX, influenced by the assimilation of עַל to עַד has ἕως with ἄν and the subjunctive.

The composite conjunction דִּי לְמַח, in which *dî* merely reinforces the conjunction לְמַח, is found only in Ezra 7 23 (8 21). The LXX has ἕνεκα τοῦ μή, while Theodotion has μή ποτε with the aorist subjunctive, evidently considering *dî* a colorless particle.

Thus, these Aramaic compounds are either translated by a single conjunction, or resolved into their component parts and represented by a composite conjunction or by a preposition and relative. In ὃν τρόπον an adverbial accusative is antecedent to the relative. In one case Theodotion has a substantivized relative clause dependent on a preposition. *Dî* is represented by a relative in most of the composite forms, but the preposition associated with *dî* is the factor which influenced the translations most, leading the translators to choose conjunctions resembling the preposition. Thus, for example, the overuse of ἕως and its compounds compared to the absence of other temporal conjunctions with a future reference is a mark of translation.

The only clear example of mistranslation is in Dan 2 8 where the LXX treated דִּי כְּלַקְבֵּל as a comparative instead of a causal conjunction; it is due to a confusion over the meaning of a compound conjunction used in different ways.

⁹⁸ See HP 23, 62, 147.

5. The translation of *dī* in the preposition דל

The preposition דל, "without," appears four times in Biblical Aramaic. In Dan 2 34, 45 both versions have *ἀνευ*. In Ezra 7 22 (8 20) the LXX has the preposition *ἐκ* (*ἐκ πλήθους*, "beyond number") and in 6 9 (6 29), a privative prefix (*ἀναμφοισβητήτως*, "without dispute"). In both cases Theodotion used a relative pronoun, a possible source of confusion and mistranslation.⁹⁹

6. Conclusions

The translations of *dī* may now be summarized as follows.

1. Article,
 - a) With attributive phrases.
 - b) With attributive participles.
 - c) With infinitives,
 - (1) Where the Aramaic clause has an infinitive as verb.
 - (2) After prepositions, in translation of compound conjunctions,
 - i) *ἄμα*.
 - ii) *ἐνεκα, ἐνεκεν*.
 - iii) *ἕως*.
2. Relative pronoun, *ὅς, ὅστις*, or plural of *ὅσος*,
 - a) In attributive clauses, mostly as object of verb.
 - b) In relative clauses of cause.
 - c) In relative clauses of purpose and result, with a future verb and sometimes with the relative *ὅστις*.
 - d) In conditional relative clauses, mostly future and preceded by *πᾶς* or antecedent omitted.
 - e) With prepositions, in translation of compound conjunctions,
 - (1) *ἀπό*.
 - (2) *ἕως*.
 - f) With an adverbial accusative as antecedent — *ὃν τρόπον* in translation of *כלקבל די*.

⁹⁹ But, in 6 9, *ὃ ἐὰν αἰτήσωσιν*, "whatever they may ask," seems to be based on *דל די ישאלו* rather than on *דל לא שלו*.

- g) Relative adverb of place,
 - (1) οὐ.
 - (2) ὅπου.
- 3. Conjunctions,
 - a) ὅτι,
 - (1) In noun clauses.
 - (2) In direct discourse.
 - (3) In loosely connected circumstantial clauses.
 - (4) In causal clauses.
 - (5) In compound conjunctions,
 - i) καθότι.
 - ii) διότι.
 - b) ἵνα with the future indicative or the aorist subjunctive.
 - c) ὅπως with the future indicative or the aorist subjunctive.
 - d) ὥς,
 - (1) In loosely connected circumstantial clauses.
 - (2) In the compound conjunction καθὼς.
- 4. Miscellaneous renderings,
 - a) ὅτε, or ὅταν, relative adverbs.
 - b) Conjunctions used in translating compound conjunctions: ἐπεί, ἐπειδή, ὥς, ὥσπερ, ἡνίκα, μὴ ποτε.
 - c) Prepositions, translating אֶל־: ἄνευ, ἐκ.
- 5. Omissions from Greek translations,
 - a) In genitive phrases.
 - b) In expressions of substance.
 - c) In direct discourse.
 - d) When replaced by καί before anaphoric suffixes, etc.
 - e) In idiomatic translations,
 - (1) The accusative and infinitive.
 - (2) The supplementary participle.
 - (3) The infinitive after adverbs, etc.

The translators considered *dī* a relative particle of many different uses. They attached no special meaning to it, unless it be indicated by the frequent use of the article to translate *dī*; but this seems due to a preference for a literary type of translation wherever possible without disturbing the original wording. Except in the literal version of Aquila, Greek syntax determined

the translation of *dî*. Thus, it is rendered by the appropriate Greek equivalent, whether it be the article, a relative pronoun, or a conjunction, or even if it is omitted from the translation. The translation of *dî per se* affords no criteria for the identification of translation Greek.

However, because the Greek conforms to the syntactic structure of the Aramaic wherever possible, certain translation phenomena make their appearance. These include, on the one hand, a lack of proportion in the Greek style — due to the consistent use of certain syntactic constructions and the neglect of others — and, on the other, to the use of locutions that do not appear in normal Greek. To the first class belong the placing of attributive phrases and participles after their nouns, the use of the article with active participles only, the use of the relative mainly as the object with present and aorist indicatives, the use of conjunctive clauses instead of idiomatic Greek constructions with the infinitive or participle, and the overuse of certain conjunctions such as *εως*. To the second belong the use of noun clauses after verbs where a supplementary participle or an accusative and infinitive would be more correct, and the employment of the future indicative in some general relative clauses where a present tense would be better.

Mistranslations are infrequent, and a doubtful proof of translation. The following types may be listed:

1. Confusion between the relative and causal uses of *dî*.
2. Confusion of appositional phrases with genitive phrases.
3. Confusion due to the use of a compound conjunction in two or more different senses.
4. Misunderstanding of the compound relative form *למא די* and the preposition *דיילא*.
5. Use of the articular infinitive where *dî* is followed by an infinitive.

In some cases the translator's interpretation of the text may be correct. In others, the mistranslation is not recognizable without a knowledge of the original text. Most significant is confusion between the different uses of a compound conjunction, for the Greek may reflect the form of the Aramaic conjunction.

Where the syntax of the Aramaic was at variance with that of Greek the translator sometimes cut the Gordian knot with an idiomatic rendering. The anticipatory suffix of the genitive could not be represented in Greek without being obviously redundant and erroneous, and it is found only in readings attributed to Aquila. Anaphoric suffixes in relative clauses which were also represented by him are rarely represented by the other translators. Sometimes the translators were led to use expressions of dubious correctness. The use of an infinitive after *dî* led Theodotion to translate by the articular infinitive regardless of its propriety.

The fact that some of these constructions may be paralleled by unusual examples from the *koiné* does not discredit them as translation phenomena; in the *koiné* they are the exception, in translation Greek they are the rule for their particular type of clause. Some of these expressions might be used by an Aramaic-speaking author, but such errors are much less common in written compositions than in speech. Translation Greek should have only errors due to mistranslation, but a person unfamiliar with the language would make errors in the choice of conjunctions, the use of mood, and other things that could not be explained as translation phenomena.

Some of the phenomena noted are strictly translation phenomena, shared neither by the *koiné* nor by the work of an Aramaic-speaking author. The use of the article and attributive participle in translating relative clauses is the mark of a man with some sense of literary values, who used the more literary expression when free to do so. The attraction of the relative pronoun into the case of the antecedent illustrates the same thing. What kept these men from writing better Greek was simply their conception of the sacredness of the text.

The LXX translation is somewhat freer and more idiomatic than that of Theodotion. In the case of clauses with *dî* the LXX made a paraphrastic or idiomatic translation some fifty times, while Theodotion did so only ten times. The LXX omitted the clause with *dî* or placed its matter in another context over seventy times, while Theodotion did so only twelve times. At times the LXX is so paraphrastic (e. g., Daniel, chapter 5) as

to constitute an interpretation or retelling of the story; yet the Aramaic word order and method of expression are still retained.

Theodotion is much more exact. His translations appear to be based on a relatively good understanding of the text, and his interpretation of the meaning of *dî* is usually correct. Mistranslations occasionally occur, but in difficult passages or due to a different reading of the text for which Theodotion himself may not be responsible. His most consistent error is in the use of the articular infinitive where *dî* is followed by an infinitive or the imperfect of אָהָה. Otherwise he is not bound by lexicographic rules and usually suits his translation to the occasion.

Extreme literalism does not appear except in the work of Aquila. In their treatment of the text the translators reflect their own attitude towards it. The growth in canonization which took place between the age of the LXX translations and that of Theodotion is exemplified by the difference in their renderings. Aquila's rabbinic training is shown in his tendency to translate verbatim, disregarding Greek syntax and neither adding to, nor subtracting from, the exact content of the original.

The following conclusions may thus be reached:

1. The translation of *dî* *per se* does not leave its mark on the Greek.
2. Mistranslations are relatively few, and often not discernable without a knowledge of the original text.
3. Translation phenomena include:
 - a) Retention of word order.
 - b) Lack of proportion in the use of syntactic forms.
 - c) Excessive use of certain conjunctions.
 - d) Use of dubious Greek constructions.
 - e) Consistency in translation.
 - f) Literalism, when the text is regarded as particularly sacred.
4. The number of translation phenomena depends on the attitude of the translator to the text.
5. Translation phenomena appear in Greek that is otherwise good, and are to be distinguished from
 - a) The errors that appear in *koiné* sources where the grammar and syntax are generally poor.
 - b) The errors that might be ascribed to an Aramaic-speaking author.

TABLE 1

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *Di*
IN ATTRIBUTIVE AND APPositionAL PHRASES AND
AS SUBJECT IN NOMINAL RELATIVE CLAUSES

MT	GREEK TEXT ^a	LXX	THEODOTION	MT	GREEK TEXT ^a	LXX	THEODOTION
די בירושלם				In Other Attributive Phrases			
Ezra				Ezra			
4: 24	2: 25	τοῦ	τοῦ	5: 1	6: 1	τοὺς	τοὺς
5: 2	6: 2	τόν	τόν	5: 10	6: 11	τοὺς, τῶν	τῶν
5: 14	6: 17	τοῦ	τοῦ	5: 17	6: 20	τοῖς	Genitive
5: 15	6: 18	τῶ	τῶ	6: 2	6: 22	τῇ	
5: 16	6: 19	τοῦ	τοῦ	7: 14	8: 12		τῶ
5: 17	6: 21	τοῦ	τόν	7: 25	8: 23		ἡ ^c
6: 3	6: 23	τόν	τοῦ	Dan.			
6: 5	6: 25	τοῦ	τοῦ	3: 20	. . .	τῶν	No parallel
6: 5	6: 25	τόν	τόν ^b	5: 13	. . .	ὅς ^f	ὁ
6: 9	6: 29	οἱ	τῶν	6: 14	6: 13		ὁς
6: 12	6: 32	τόν	τόν	7: 7	. . .	(τά)	τά
6: 18	7: 9	Paraphrase	τοῦ	7: 20	. . .	τῶν	τῶν
7: 16	8: 13	τό	τόν	In Appositional Phrases			
7: 17	8: 15	τό	τοῦ				
Dan.				Ezra			
5: 2	. . .	Paraphrase	τοῦ	6: 8	6: 28	Paraphrase	τῶν
5: 3	. . .		τοῦ	Dan.			
די בעבר נהרה				2: 39	. . .	No parallel	ἡτις
				5: 3	. . .		
Ezra				Subject in Nominal Clauses			
5: 6	6: 7	(οἱ)	οἱ ^c	Ezra			
6: 6	6: 26	(τοῖς)	οἱ ^d	4: 9	2: 15		οἱ
7: 21	8: 19	Genitive	ταῖς	6: 15	7: 5	τοῦ	ὁς
7: 25	8: 21	Paraphrase	τῶ	Dan.			
				2: 30	. . .	τῇ	τῇ
				7: 17	. . .		τά

^a The location of the passage in the Greek Text where numbering is different from that of the MT. So also in subsequent tables.

^b So read A, N; HP 19, 93, 108, *et al.*

^d So read A, N, *et al.*

^f In vs. 10 in the LXX.

^c So read A, *et al.*

^e So read A, N, and Eth.

^g So reads A.

TABLE 2

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *DI*
WHEN SUBJECT OF A VERBAL FORM

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTION	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTION
Subject of a Participle				Subject of an Imperfect Verb			
Ezra				Ezra			
4: 17	2: 21	(τοῖς)	τούς	7: 20	8: 17	ᾔσα (ἄν)	δ ἄν
5: 4	6: 4	οἱ	τῶν	Dan.			
7: 19	8: 17	τά	τᾶ	2: 10	. . .	Paraphrase	ὅστις
7: 25	8: 23	τούς	τῶ	2: 11	. . .	ὅς	ὅς
Dan.				2: 25	. . .	ὅς	ὅστις
2: 40	. . .	ὁ (?)	. . .	2: 39	. . .	ἡ	ἡ
3: 31	. . .	ταῖς, τοῖς ^a	τοῖς	2: 44	. . .	ἡτις	ἡτις
4: 34	. . .	. . .	τούς	3: 15	. . .	Paraphrase	ὅς
5: 5	. . .	No parallel	τῆς	3: 29	3: 96	ὅς	ὅστις
5: 23	. . .	. . .	οἱ	4: 32	. . .	. . .	ὅς
5: 25	. . .	. . .	ἡ	6: 9	6: 8	. . .	. . .
6: 26	. . .	τοῖς	τοῖς	6: 13	6: 12	Paraphrase	No parallel
				6: 27	6: 26	. . .	No parallel
				7: 14	. . .	ἡτις	ἡτις
				7: 14	. . .	ἡτις	No parallel
				7: 23	. . .	ἡτις	ἡτις
Subject of a Perfect Verb				Subject of a Periphrastic Form			
Jer.							
10: 11	. . .	οἱ	. . .	Ezra			
Ezra				5: 11	6: 13	Paraphrase	ὅς
4: 12	2: 17	No parallel	No parallel	Dan.			
6: 12	6: 32	οἱ	οἱ	7: 19	. . .	τοῦ	ὅτι
Dan.							
2: 14	. . .	ᾧ	ὅς				
2: 35	. . .	ὁ	ὁ				
3: 22	. . .	τούς	τούς ^b				
3: 28	3: 95	τούς	ὅτι				
4: 17	. . .	τό	τό ^c				
4: 19	. . .	No parallel	ὅτι				
4: 21	. . .	Paraphrase	ὁ				
6: 25	6: 24	τούς	τούς				
7: 20	. . .	τοῦ	τοῦ				

^a LXX, 4: 34b, c; arrangement of text varies from that of MT.^b So A, V; HP 22, 62, 147, *et al.*; B does not translate.^c So A, Q, V; HP 62, 147; B omits.

TABLE 3

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *Di*
WHEN OBJECT OF A VERBAL FORM

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
Object of a Participle				Object of a Perfect Verb			
Dan.				Dan.			
2: 11	. . .	ὁν	ὁν	2: 23	. . .	ὁσα	ἃ
2: 27	. . .	ὁ	ὁ	2: 24	. . .	τόν	ὁν
3: 17	. . .	ὁν	ὃ	2: 26	. . .	ὁ	ὁ
6: 17	6: 16	ὃ	ὃ	3: 2	. . .	ἦν	ἦς
6: 21	6: 20	ὃ	ὃ	3: 3	. . .	ἦς	ἦς
7: 11	. . .	ὡν	ὡν	3: 3	. . .	ἦς	ἦς ^c
Object of a Periphrastic Form				3: 5	. . .	ἦν	ἦ
Dan.				3: 12	. . .	οὖς	οὖς
5: 19 ^a	. . .	. . .	οὖς	3: 12	. . .	ἦ	ἦ
Object of a Perfect Verb				3: 14	. . .	ἦν	ἦ
Ezra				3: 15	. . .	ἦ	ἦ
4: 10	2: 15	. . .	ὡν	3: 18	. . .	ἦν	ἦ
4: 11	2: 16	. . .	ἦς	3: 32	3: 99	ἃ ^d	ἃ
4: 18	2: 22	ἦν	ὁν	4: 6	. . .	. . .	οὖ
5: 6	6: 7	ἦς	ἦς	4: 17	. . .	. . .	ὁ
5: 14	6: 17	ἃ	ἃ	4: 27	. . .	ἦν	ἦν
5: 14	6: 17	Paraphrase	τῶ	5: 2	. . .	ἃ	ἃ
6: 5	6: 25	ἃ	ἃ	5: 3	. . .	. . .	ἃ
7: 15	8: 13	ἃ	ὁ ^b	5: 13	. . .	. . .	ἦς
				5: 19	. . .	. . .	ἦς
				6: 14	6: 13	. . .	οὖ ^e

^a Clause repeated four times in verse.^b So read the majority of cursives.^c So A, Γ; HP 22, 23, 33, 34, 35, 36, 62.^d The reference for the LXX equivalent is 4: 34c.^e So A; HP 23, 62, 147.

TABLE 4
GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *DI*
WHEN A CASUS PENDENS

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	AQUILA ^a
Before a Nominal Suffix				
Ezra 7: 15	8: 13	Paraphrase	τῷ ^b	
Dan. 2: 11	. . .	οῦ	ὧν	
2: 26	. . .	Paraphrase	οῦ	οῦ αὐτοῦ ^c
4: 5	. . .		οῦ	
4: 16	. . .		οῦ	
5: 12	. . .		καὶ αὐτοῦ	
5: 23	. . .	καὶ αὐτοῦ	οῦ αὐτοῦ	
Before a Prepositional Suffix				
Dan. 2: 37	. . .	καὶ σοι	ᾧ	ᾧ σοι ^d
4: 5	. . .		ὅς	
5: 11	. . .	καὶ ἐν αὐτῷ	ἐν ᾧ	ἐν ᾧ ἐν αὐτῷ ^e
6: 3	6: 2	καὶ with a genitive.	ὧν ἐξ αὐτῶν ^f	
Before an Accusative Suffix ^g				
Dan. 3: 12	. . .	οὓς	οὓς	οὓς αὐτοὺς ^d
6: 17	6: 16	ᾧ	ᾧ	ᾧ αὐτῷ ^d
6: 21	6: 20	ᾧ	ᾧ	ᾧ αὐτῷ ^d
Before a Verbal Suffix ^g				
Ezra 5: 14	6: 17	Paraphrase	τῷ ^b	
Dan. 4: 27	. . .	ἣν	ἣν	
With a Suffix in a Following Clause ^g				
Ezra 4: 10	2: 16		ὧ καὶ αὐτοὺς	
5: 14	6: 17	ᾧ καὶ αὐτά	ᾧ καὶ αὐτά	

^a Listed only where preserved readings differ from Theodotion's text.^b Text misunderstood by the translator.^c So HP 23.^d So HP 62, 147.^e So HP 22, 23, 34, 36, 42, 48, 51, 62, 147, 149, 231.^f So A.^g Also listed in Table 3.

TABLE 5

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE RELATIVE PRONOUN *Di*
IN SPECIAL TYPES OF RELATIVE CLAUSES

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
With an Antecedent כִּי				In Compound Relatives: מִן, מִה			
Ezra				Dan.			
6: 11	6: 31	ὅσοι (ἐάν)	ὅς	2: 45		τά	ἃ
6: 12	6: 32	ὅς	ὅς	3: 6		ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν)
7: 16	8: 13	ὅ (ἐάν)	ὅ τι (ἄν) ^a	3: 11		ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν) ^e
7: 21	8: 19	ὅσα (ἐάν) ^b	ὅ (ἄν)	4: 14		ὅσα (ἄν)	ῶ (ἐάν)
7: 23	8: 21	Paraphrase	ὅ	4: 22			ῶ (ἐάν) ^f
7: 26	8: 24	ὅσοι (ἐάν)	ὅς (ἄν)	4: 29		ῶ (ἐάν)	ῶ (ἐάν)
Dan.				5: 21			ῶ (ἐάν) ^g
3: 10		ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν)	As a Relative of Place			
3: 29	3: 96	ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν) ^c	Ezra			
5: 7		ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν)	6: 1	6: 22	τοῖς ^h	ὅπου
6: 8	6: 7	ὅς (ἄν)	ὅς (ἄν)	6: 3	6: 23	ὅπου	οὗ
6: 13	6: 12	Paraphrase	ὅς (ἄν)	Dan.			
6: 16	6: 15		ὅς (ἄν)	2: 38		Paraphrase	ὅπου
In Compound Relatives: מִן, מִה				As a Relative of Time			
Ezra				Dan.			
6: 8	6: 27	ἵνα	μή ποτέ τι ^d	3: 5		ὅταν	ἥ (ἄν)
7: 18	8: 16	ὅσα (ἄν)	εἰ τί	3: 15		ἅμα τῷ	ὥς ἄν
Dan.							
2: 28		ἃ	ἃ				
2: 29			τί				
2: 29		ἃ	ἃ				

^a So A, N, *et al.*^b So A, N, *et al.*^c So Q; cf. also A, Q^{ms}, and HP 23, which have ἥ (ἄν).^d So A, N, *et al.*^e So HP 23, 62, 147.^f So A, Q; HP 23, *et al.*^g So A; HP 22, 33, 34, 35, 36, 42, 48, 49, 51, 90, 91, 106, 148, *et al.*^h LXX read the Aramaic differently.

TABLE 6

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE GENITIVE PARTICLE WHEN
USED TO EXPRESS A TRUE GENITIVE RELATIONSHIP

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
With Definite Nouns				With Definite Nouns			
Ezra				Dan.			
4: 10	2: 15	Paraphrase	. . (τῆς)	5: 24	. . .		No parallel
4: 15	2: 18	ἀπό	. . (τῶν)	6: 14	6: 13		. . (τῆς)
4: 23	2: 25	Paraphrase	. . (τοῦ)	6: 17	6: 16	. . (τῶν)	. . (τῶν)
5: 2	6: 2	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)	6: 20	6: 19	. . (τῶν)	. . (τῶν)
5: 13	6: 16	Paraphrase		7: 27	. . .	Paraphrase	. . (τῶν)
5: 14	6: 17	Paraphrase	. . (τοῦ) ^a	With an Anticipatory Suffix			
5: 14	6: 17	Paraphrase	. . (τοῦ)				
5: 14	6: 17	τοῦ ^b	. . (τοῦ) ^a				
5: 16	6: 19	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)	Ezra			
5: 17	6: 20	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)	5: 11	6: 12	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
7: 12	8: 9	. . (τοῦ)	τοῦ (?)	Dan.			
7: 17	8: 15	. . (τοῦ)	τοῦ (?)	2: 20	. . .	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
7: 21	8: 19	. . (τοῦ)	τοῦ (?)	2: 44	. . .	. . (τῶν)	. . (τῶν)
7: 26	8: 24	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)	3: 8	. . .	Paraphrase	Paraphrase
7: 26	8: 24	τόν ^a	. . (τοῦ)	3: 25	3: 92	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
Dan.				3: 26	3: 93	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
2: 14	. . .	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)	3: 28	3: 95	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
2: 15	. . .	. . (τοῦ) ^c	. . (τοῦ)	3: 29	3: 96	No parallel	No parallel
2: 19	. . .	Paraphrase	. . (τῆς)	4: 23	. . .	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)
2: 25	. . .	. . (τῆς)	. . (τῆς)	6: 25	6: 24	Paraphrase	Paraphrase
2: 41	. . .		. . (τῆς)	6: 27	6: 26	. . (τοῦ)	No parallel
2: 49	. . .		. . (τῆς)	With Indefinite Nouns			
4: 12	. . .	Paraphrase	. . (τῆ)				
4: 20	. . .		. . (τῆ)	Dan.			
4: 26	. . .		Paraphrase	2: 41	. . .	No parallel	
5: 5	. . .	Paraphrase	. . (τοῦ)	5: 5	. . .	ὥσεί	No parallel
5: 5	. . .	Paraphrase	. . (τοῦ)	7: 4	. . .	ὥσεί	ὥσεί
5: 13	. . .	. . (τῆς) ^d	. . (τῆς)	7: 6	. . .	No parallel	No parallel
5: 23	. . .	. . (τοῦ)	. . (τοῦ)				

^a So A, N, *et al.*^b Read as an attributive prepositional phrase.^c A conflate reading from Theodotion.^d LXX placed the phrase in vs. 10.

TABLE 7
GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE GENITIVE PARTICLE
IN PHRASES EXPRESSING SUBSTANCE

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
With Definite Nouns				With Indefinite Nouns			
Ezra				Dan.			
5: 14	6: 17	... (τά)	... (τά)	4: 20	...	...	No parallel
6: 5	6: 25	... (τά)	... (τά)	7: 7	...	No parallel	No parallel
Dan.				7: 9	...	No parallel	No parallel
2: 34	...	... (τούς)	... (τούς)	7: 10	...	No parallel	No parallel
2: 38	...	... (ῆ)	... (ῆ)	In the Predicate Position			
3: 22	...	...	...	Dan.			
5: 7	...	No parallel	... (ὁ)	2: 32	...	'Από and the genitive	No parallel, genitive
5: 16	...	No parallel	... (ὁ)	2: 32	...	No parallel	No parallel
5: 29	...	No parallel	... (τόν)	2: 32	...	No parallel	No parallel
With Indefinite Nouns				2: 33	...	No parallel	No parallel
Ezra				2: 33	...	No parallel, genitive	No parallel
6: 4	6: 24	No parallel	No parallel	2: 33	...	No parallel	No parallel
6: 4	6: 24	No parallel	No parallel	7: 19	...	No parallel	No parallel
Dan.				7: 19	...	No parallel	No parallel
3: 1	...	No parallel	No parallel				
4: 12	...	No parallel	No parallel				

TABLE 8

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE SIMPLE CONJUNCTION *Dī*
IN NOUN CLAUSES

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
With the Noun Clause as Object				Direct Discourse			
Ezra				Dan.			
4: 15	2: 18	ὅπως	ἵνα	2: 25	. . .	ὅτι	No parallel
4: 15	2: 19	ὅτι	ὅτι	5: 7	. . .	No parallel	No parallel
4: 16	2: 20	ὅτι	ὅτι	6: 6	6: 5		No parallel
4: 19	2: 22	ὅτι	ὅτι	6: 14	6: 13		No parallel
7: 24	8: 22	ὅπως	No parallel	With Noun Clause as Subject			
Dan.				Ezra			
2: 8	. . .	ὅτι	ὅτι	4: 12	2: 17	ὅτι	ὅτι
2: 8	. . .	ὅτι	ὅτι	4: 13	2: 18		ὅτι
2: 9	. . .	ὅτι	ὅτι	5: 8	6: 8	ὅτι	ὅτι
2: 16	. . .	ἵνα	ὅπως	5: 17	6: 21	(Supple- mentary part.)	ὅτι
2: 45	. . .	(Acc. and inf.)	ὅτι	Dan.			
2: 47	. . .	No parallel	No parallel	3: 18	. . .	ὅτι	ὅτι
3: 27	3: 94	ὅτι	ὅτι	With the Noun Clause Appositional			
4: 6			ὅτι	Ezra			
4: 14	. . .	(Acc. and inf.)	ὅτι	6: 11	6: 31	ἵνα	ὅτι
4: 22	. . .		ὅτι	7: 13	8: 10	(Acc. and inf.)	ὅτι
4: 23	. . .		Paraphrase	7: 21	8: 19	ἵνα	ὅτι
4: 29	. . .	ὅτι ^a	ὅτι	Dan.			
5: 14	. . .		ὅτι	2: 9	. . .	No parallel	No parallel
5: 16	. . .		ὅτι	3: 10	. . .	ἵνα	No parallel
5: 21	. . .		ὅτι	3: 29	. . .	ἵνα	No parallel
5: 29	. . .	Paraphrase	τοῦ ^b	6: 8	6: 7	ὅτι	ὅπως
6: 11	6: 10	Paraphrase	ὅτι	6: 13	6: 12	ἵνα	ὅπως
6: 16	6: 15		ὅτι	6: 16	6: 15		τοῦ
				6: 27	6: 26	Paraphrase	τοῦ ^c

^a In the LXX this clause appears in vs. 28.^b So A; HP 42, 230. Lost by haplography in B *et al.*^c So A and HP 23. B *et al.* have τοῦτο.

TABLE 9

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF THE SIMPLE CONJUNCTION *δι*
IN CONJUNCTIONAL CLAUSES OTHER THAN NOUN CLAUSES

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTION	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTION
In Circumstantial Clauses				In Final Clauses			
Dan.				Ezra			
2: 41		ὥς	ὅτι	5: 10	6: 11 (ἐνεκεν τοῦ)	ὥστε	
2: 43		ὥς	ὅτι	6: 8	6: 28	τό	
4: 20		Paraphrase	ὅτι	6: 10	6: 30 ὅπως	ἵνα	
4: 23		Paraphrase	ὅτι	7: 25	8: 23 ὅπως	ἵνα	
In Causal Clauses				Dan.			
Dan.				2: 18		ὅπως	ὅπως*
2: 20		ὅτι	ὅτι	3: 15		(Infinitive)	ἵνα
2: 23		ὅτι	ὅτι	3: 28	3: 95 ἵνα	ὅπως	
2: 23		τοῦ	(ὅτι)	4: 3			ὅπως
2: 47		ὅτι	ὅτι	5: 15			ἵνα
3: 28	3: 95	ὅς	ὅς	6: 2	6: 1 Paraphrase	τοῦ	
4: 6			ὅν	6: 3	6: 2	τοῦ	
4: 15			ὅτι	6: 9	6: 8	ὅπως	
4: 31			ὅτι	6: 18	6: 17 ὅπως	ὅπως	
4: 34			ὅτι				
6: 24	6: 23		ὅτι				
6: 27	6: 26	γάρ	ὅτι				
6: 28	6: 27	Paraphrase	ὅστις				

* So A, Q *et al.*

TABLE 10

GREEK TRANSLATIONS OF *Di* IN COMPOUND CONJUNCTIONS

MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON	MT	GREEK TEXT	LXX	THEODOTON
כדי Temporal				לקבל די Comparative			
Dan. 3: 7		ὅτε	ὅταν	Ezra 6: 13	7: 1	Paraphrase	πρὸς ὃ
5: 20			ὅτε	כלקבל די Comparative			
6: 11	6: 10	(Aor. Part.)	ἥνικα	Dan. 2: 40		ὥσπερ (?)	ὃν τρόπον
6: 15	6: 14		ὥς	2: 41		καθάπερ	ὃν τρόπον
האך די Comparative				2: 45		καθάπερ	ὃν τρόπον
Dan. 2: 43		ὥσπερ	καθώς	6: 11	6: 10	καθώς	καθώς
מדי Temporal				כלקבל די Causal			
Ezra 4: 23	2: 25	(Gen. abs.)		Ezra 4: 14	2: 18	ἐπεὶ	
Dan. 4: 23			ἀφ' ἧς (ἄν)	7: 14	8: 11	καθάπερ	
מדי Causal				Dan. 2: 8		καθάπερ	καθότι
Ezra 5: 12	6: 14	ἐπεὶ	ἀφ' ὅτε	2: 10		καθάπερ	καθότι
Dan. 3: 22		ἐπειδὴ	ἐπεὶ	3: 29	3: 96	διότι	καθότι
די Temporal				4: 15			ὅτι
Dan. 2: 9		ἕως (ἄν)	ἕως οὖ	5: 12		(καὶ)	ὅτι
2: 34		ἕως ὅτου	ἕως οὖ ^a	6: 4	6: 3	καθότι	ὅτι
4: 20			ἕως οὖ	6: 5	6: 4		ὅτι
4: 22			ἕως οὖ	6: 23	6: 22	καθότι	ὅτι
4: 29			ἕως οὖ ^b	כלקבל די Concessive			
4: 30			ἕως οὖ ^b	Dan. 5: 22			Paraphrase
5: 21			ἕως οὖ	על־דברה די Final			
6: 25	6: 24		ἕως οὖ	Dan. 2: 30		ἐνεκεν τοῦ	ἐνεκεν τοῦ
7: 4		ἕως ὅτου	ἕως οὖ	4: 14		ἕως (ἄν)	ἵνα
7: 9		ἕως ὅτου ^c	ἕως ὅτου	די Final			
7: 11		καὶ	ἕως	Ezra 7: 23	8: 21	ἐνεκα τοῦ	μή ποτε
7: 22		ἕως ὅτου	ἕως οὖ				

^a So A *et al.*; B has ἕως.^b So A, Q, *et al.*; B has ἕως.^c So the Chester Beatty Papyrus of Daniel; HP 87 has ἕως ὅτε.



